



*United Unionist Election Triumph 1974.*

## ***His Vision for Unionist Unity***

However Robert's great vision was a vision of a coming together of the whole Unionist family. He worked unceasingly towards that end and many times was gravely misrepresented by those who put Party interests before the wider interests of the Province. He was an excellent constituency worker, a warm friend to all sections of his constituency, an able advocate of Ulster's case in the United Kingdom Parliament and the inveterate enemy of those who were seeking by terrorism to subvert our beloved Province.

He was the continual target of I.R.A. propaganda, and in leaving down his life in the Ulster Cause he was just sealing in death his sterling testimony to uncompromising Protestant principles, and the great tradition of Carson Unionism.

Robert was a kindly man full of Ulster humour with the sanctifying power of Christian grace. Great joy came to him and Norah with the arrival of their daughter Claire. His Parliamentary colleagues noted how this new joy flooded his heart, and how he looked forward after a hard week of labours to get back to Norah and Claire and to enjoy romping with his beloved daughter. That reflected the deep affection of the man. He had intense feeling for those that were under-privileged. He made their cause his own and was ever prepared to carry the banner for them.

## ***His Death and Funeral***

Robert is gone from us but his memory will linger, and all Ulster knows that they have been robbed of one of Ulster's greatest sons.

The many thousands of people who attended the funeral service and flocked in their multitudes to the various Cenotaph Services across the whole Province was one of the largest and most eloquent tributes ever paid to any man. Even Lord Carson, the founding father of our Province, and Lord Craigavon, its first Prime Minister, had no similar scenes at their funerals.

He has gone from us but the torch which he carried he has put into our hands. The task to defeat the terrorists, to win the war and win the peace and bring Ulster back to prosperity is ours. Let us not fail!





*Robert and Norah Bradford.*

### ***Tribute***

The following tribute written by his Parliamentary colleague and friend, Dr. Paisley, was read at the various Cenotaph Services to the tens of thousands of people who flocked there. It briefly summarises the deep feelings of the Ulster people.

"We are come here today in quiet dignity and solemnity to salute the memory of a great Ulsterman, the Rev. Robert Bradford M.P. and the memory of a great army of loyal Ulstermen and women who have fallen at the hands of Ulster's traditional enemies. We come to mourn, we come to remember, we come to unite, we come to dedicate ourselves to God and Ulster in the battle for our very existence. Bob Bradford was not only a Unionist but in the highest sense of the word he was a Protestant."

"Born and brought up in our Province, serving a hard-pressed congregation as a Methodist minister, he knew what ordinary Protestants had to face, he saw them driven from their homes by the

*Ulster mourns one of her greatest sons.*



*Wife of murdered Ulster M.P. Robert Bradford, Norah, crying on the shoulder of minister Roy Magee at the burial in Donaghadee.*



*Tens of thousands of people stopped work in Ulster in sympathy for the burial of murdered Ulster M.P. Robert Bradford — here a packed scene before the Belfast Cenotaph.*

I.R.A. murder gangs and brutally butchered in the streets and when the opportunity was given to him to put his life on the line to represent them, he was willing to pay the price as a Unionist representative. He served those who elected him with steadfastness and courage. Every one knew he was dedicated to the unity of the Unionist family and his last hours were spent in preparation of the joint Unionist visit to the United States of America. He has been done down. His voice is silent in the grave but he being dead yet speaketh. The best way we could honour his memory is to forge this day an unbreakable link among all the Unionist people who are prepared to fight and if needs be die to save Ulster from the I.R.A. terrorists and the treachery of the Thatcher administration."

"No words could describe in a brief tribute the qualities and talents of Robert Bradford but it must be said that the one thing which made him what he was was his saving faith in Jesus Christ our Lord. His conversion was the foundation of his life of service. He has gone from us like a Valiant for the Truth to the Father's House. If we would follow him there we too must have our faith in the Saviour. To Norah his wife, and Claire his little girl, to the Campbell family whose brother Ken died with him we sincerely extend our sympathy and we would include in this remembrance service all who have fallen at the hands of the I.R.A. terrorists."

"They shall grow not old even as we that are left grow old,,  
Age shall not weary them nor the years condemn,  
At the going down of the sun and in the morning  
We will remember them."

Robert was buried from the Church of one of his firmest and closest friends, the Rev. Roy Magee, Minister of Dundonald Presbyterian Church. His remains were laid to rest in the little County Down seaside resort of Donaghadee. They await the trumpet summons at the Resurrection, but as for him his redeemed spirit is with his Lord. Amidst their grief Ulster people have submitted like Job and re-echoed, in the silence of their hearts, "The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away, Blessed be the Name of the Lord".

## **IF IT HAPPENED IN THE USA**



# IF IT HAPPENED IN THE USA

*To understand the position and the attitudes of other people there is no better way than to think out how you would feel if you yourself were in the same position that they are in. What, then, would it be like if the experiences that Ulster people have gone through were to come to citizens of the USA. To put such a comparison into perspective it is necessary to adjust all figures to scale.*

## **A Deliberate Campaign**

Northern Ireland has a population of one and a half million people. From 1970 to the end of September, 1981, there have been 10,477 bombing incidents, 26,453 shootings, 16,999 civilian injuries, some of them very grave, and 2,133 deaths. These deaths were made up of 1,515 civilians, 158 police and 460 members of the army. During most of this period it has been necessary to keep about 30,000 men and women under arms for security purposes.

Looked at in this way, as mere statistics, these facts may not seem as disturbing as they are in actual experience. For example, it can be pointed out that more people have been killed in road accidents in the



same period than have been killed in terrorist violence. And the violent death rate in proportion to the whole population is not greater than that in some American cities.

What makes a very great difference is that this violence in Ulster has not been the result of fortuitous accidents or the unconnected erratic behaviour of separate individuals. It has been the effect of a co-ordinated and deliberate campaign, masterminded from a headquarters in an adjacent country. The incidents have been planned and have been located so as to destroy people's means of livelihood and disrupt their public services and welfare. In particular areas the effort has been to produce the effect of genocide by terrorising people away from their homes and farms. Some of the targets have been cultural, and libraries, art treasures and historical records have been destroyed as well as ancient buildings and churches. The campaign has been the embodiment of a lunatic hatred against the whole Ulster people.

## **A Campaign against the USA**

How would citizens of the United States feel if, in the hope of bringing about a take-over of their country and the placing of it under the rule of the government of another adjacent country, terrorists brought about a similar state of affairs in the US? To put the possibility into perspective, we take account of the fact that the population of the USA is 145 times that of Northern Ireland.

This would mean that there would be 309,285 deaths, of which 219,675 would be civilian deaths, 22,910 would be police and 66,700 would be in the army. To maintain security, it would be necessary to have 4,350,000 men and women under arms most of the time. There would be 1,519,165 bombing incidents, 3,835,685 shootings and 2,464,855 civilian injuries.

If this happened in the USA, how would US citizens regard the country on whose behalf the campaign of murder and violence was being waged and from within whose territory it was being masterminded? And if some of the perpetrators of these violent acts were caught and put in prison, would US citizens welcome demands from other countries that such prisoners should be given freedom to run their prisons according to their own wishes? And if it was clear that the perpetrators of violence were receiving arms and support from eastern Europe and had links with worldwide Marxist organisations, would US citizens have more kindly feelings towards them? Would US citizens admire and patronise those





*Communist weapons bought with American dollars to kill Ulster Unionists.*

who committed murders in such a campaign but ignore the widows and orphans of those who were murdered?

### ***Another Campaign for Reunification***

There are, of course, other ways of making a comparison. Imagine that, instead of involving the whole of the USA, the campaign was directed to the reunification of Texas with Mexico, against the will of its inhabitants. In such a case we would have to multiply the Ulster figures by only seven. There would be only about 15,000 people killed in Texas, 185,000 shootings, over 70,000 bombings, 210,000 people kept under arms, and so on.

What would be the attitude of most US citizens, then, to these troubles in Texas and this demand for its reunification with Mexico? Would they welcome senior officials of the British government declaring that the people of Britain were hoping and praying for the reunification of Mexico?

No doubt the USA, like Britain and most other countries, has its Quislings; but would there be much public support for those in the USA who supported the terrorist objective of transferring Texas to Mexico, along with its inhabitants who did not want to be transferred, particularly if those supporters of the terrorists objective did so on the ground that this would be warmly approved of in Cuba and in the USSR? One would like to think that the vast majority of American people would want the Texans to be allowed to retain the American allegiance and citizenship that they preferred. And it is certain that most people in Britain would agree.

### ***The Western Alliance***

Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom is the ally and partner of the USA in NATO and in what is broadly called the Western Alliance. Does it help the USA and its allies if a native American pressure group, to the undoubted satisfaction of Marxist terrorist movements throughout the world, advocates the cutting off of territory from the United Kingdom and the ceding of this territory, against the wishes of its inhabitants, to a country, outside the Alliance altogether, where the USSR maintains a surprisingly large embassy staff in the relatively small city of Dublin.

Money has come from the USA to provide arms and support for the killing of British citizens in Northern Ireland. Those who contribute such money are either people of feeble intelligence who have fallen naively for the lies of Irish Republican propaganda or else — and this is a grave possibility — they are enemies of the American people, of the American way of life and of the Western Alliance, who are working as the agents of those alien forces which want to destroy the standards and civilisation which we in the West have created and are proud to uphold.

## **Ulster — A Distinct British Entity**




## Ulster — a Distinct British Entity

*Geographical circumstances gave Ulster a distinct identity separate from the rest of Ireland even in prehistoric times. The populating of Ulster by people from England and Scotland was part of the same great movement of population that created modern North America and particularly the USA. But the people who were already in Ulster were not treated like Red Indians. There was mingling and assimilation of peoples. Religious or political affiliations today are not a reflection of ethnic differences in the 17th century but have arisen largely from subsequent causes.*

*Today, like Scotland or Wales, Ulster is one of the national components of the United Kingdom. The historical processes which have created modern Ulster can no more be put into reverse than those which have created the USA.*

### Ancient Ulster

Evidence from prehistoric times shows that the northern part of Ireland was the home of a succession of cultures rather different from Southern Ireland. Ulster, the modern Northern Ireland, emerged from the mists of pre-history as a distinctive kingdom, often at war with the rest of Ireland. The stories of the Red Branch chivalry, and the legendary exploits of Ulster's hero Cuchulainn, belong to a period just over two thousand years ago. The whole history of Ulster has ever since shown marked differences from that of the rest of the island.





The reasons for these differences are fundamentally geographical. Ulster is very close to Scotland, only twelve miles apart. Looking across the narrow sea today, it is quite possible to see buildings in Scotland. There was constant movement of people across that narrow sea and a deep involvement of the communities living on both sides in one another's affairs. Until fairly recent historical times, also, Ulster was isolated from the rest of Ireland by an area of forest, lake and swamp along its southern frontier.

The ancient Ulster did not have lasting fixed frontiers. Sometimes it was larger and sometimes smaller than the modern Northern Ireland which now contains the essential Ulster heartland. The large Ulster of nine counties, three of which are now in the Irish Republic, was the arbitrary invention of English officials in the early 17th century and has never had any administrative significance in later times apart from certain "inter-provincial" sporting events.

### ***Newcomers from Britain***

In eastern Ulster there has been a small continuous English-speaking element living there for over eight centuries. In the early 17th century, however, there was a large-scale emigration of people from England and Scotland to Ulster. This occurred at the same time as the first British emigration to North America and was regarded by the English government as being in many respects a similar operation.

This event, called the Ulster Plantation, finally swung the balance of linguistic and cultural predominance in Ulster so as to make the province permanently English-speaking, just as the establishment of the English-speaking colonies, begun at the same time in America, brought about more gradually a similar transformation in North America.

The Ulster Plantation, however, was not the only movement of population into Ulster. Newcomers continued to arrive throughout the 17th century and later, mostly from Britain but some coming as refugees from France. Today two-thirds of the population of Northern Ireland live in areas that did not fall within the scope of the Ulster Plantation scheme, whose effects have been sometimes exaggerated.

### ***The Mingling of People***

Between the movement of new population into Ulster and the similar movement into North America there is one great difference. In America

the older inhabitants, the "Red Indians", were virtually driven out and exterminated. In Ulster the older inhabitants were assimilated into a new social framework.

Those who lost most by the population change were the old economically unproductive warrior class, some of whom continued to live a marauding life for many years afterwards. The humbler working people mostly stayed in the areas where they had lived before. Their social organisation had been very primitive. They had not pursued a settled agriculture or owned farms or built permanent houses but had carried on a primitive cultivation in kin groups. When they ploughed, they did so by tying a small ineffective plough to the horse's tail. The new settlers introduced a more advanced agriculture, cleared land, and made the country capable of sustaining a much larger population. Contrary to government rules, they took on many of the older inhabitants as workers and as tenants of land; and with time there was assimilation in language and often in religion and in personal names.

The attempt today to argue that there are still two "communities" in Ulster, made up of descendants of two 17th century populations, is false. The past cannot be unscrambled. In particular it is unsound to try to project the past into present-day religious affiliations. A study of surnames and family histories shows that this does not work out. Many members of the various Protestant churches have family names which are obviously of ancient Irish origin, while many Roman Catholics have English or Lowland Scot names or names which indicate descent from recent immigrants from other parts of Ireland.

### ***Opportunity Under the Union***

During the 18th century many people from Ulster emigrated to America. These are the people often described in American history books as the Scotch Irish. They played an immense part in the American Revolution. Their story is recorded in another section of this book. They had gone to America largely through dissatisfaction with conditions at home in Ulster and they sent many radical political and social ideas back home.

There was deep discontent in Ulster at the close of the 18th century, because of discriminatory laws against Protestants who were not Anglicans, because of restrictions on trade, the arbitrary behaviour of landlords and the absence of genuine democratic institutions and accountable government.



The British government's solution for these, and for discontents in other parts of Ireland, was the Act of Union of 1800, which brought Ireland as a whole into one United Kingdom with Great Britain.

During the years that followed, discrepancies and inequalities in civil rights and citizenship as between Ireland and Great Britain were progressively removed. Irish representation in the Westminster Parliament became bigger in proportion to the population than that of the rest of the United Kingdom. Many social reforms were introduced during the 19th century, and tenants of land were enabled to become the outright owners of the land they farmed. Landlords as a class were practically abolished.

Taking advantage of the conditions created by the Union, Ulster people extended their industrial activity in textiles, shipbuilding and various forms of food production. They entered fully into the spirit of the Union and were happy in their full British citizenship. This fulfilment and the stability which it created laid the foundation of those British loyalties which are to this day the most powerful force in Ulster life.

## **Southern Ireland's Secession from the Union**



## **Southern Ireland's Secession from the Union**

*In 1921 the British government faced the same issue that faced the U.S. government in 1861 and chose a different course of action from that taken in America. A secession from the Union was permitted.*

*The secession of the Irish Republic from the United Kingdom brought Ulster's loyalty to the Union into prominence by contrast, particularly in wartime. The Republic's lack of success in many fields has strengthened this loyalty in Ulster. In many respects the Irish Republic is a failed political entity, and the need to distract public attention from the disastrous economic and social effects of that failure has motivated the Republic's attacks on Northern Ireland.*

### **Southern Ireland Breaks Away**

While there was an unshakeable allegiance to the Union in Ulster, political separatism became increasingly predominant in southern Ireland, with demands for a separate Irish legislature. During World War I in 1916 there was armed rising in Dublin, distantly patronised by the German government and aimed at establishing an Irish Republic.

The situation which the British government had to face after World War I was the same as that which the United States government had to face in 1861, a movement to secede from the Union. What the United States government fought a long war to prevent, the British government, in 1921, conceded after a very brief resistance. Southern Ireland was allowed to secede from the United Kingdom, being at first known as the Irish Free State and later as the Republic of Ireland.

### **Self-Determination for Ulster**

There was no corresponding desire for secession in Ulster, where the overwhelming majority of people wanted to stay British and maintain the Union, for which indeed they only recently made heavy sacrifices, particularly in the Battle of the Somme.

Given the name of Northern Ireland, this part of the United Kingdom remained in the United Kingdom, and its inhabitants retained unimpaired their full British citizenship as was their wish.

There was no reason why the people of Northern Ireland had to make the same political choice as the southern Irish. At no time has Northern Ireland been politically united with southern Ireland in any modern sense, except under British rule. When that rule was ended in southern Ireland, the bond between the two countries, north and south, also came to an end.

In the period after World War I, the doctrine of "self-determination" was widely popular. It was particularly advocated by President Wilson. When the British government gave a devolved parliament and government to Northern Ireland, it was specifically stated in Parliament that this was done to provide for "self-determination".

### **Mutual Agreement and "Neighbourly Comradeship"**

In the early years of the new Irish Free State there was much discussion and some controversy about the demarcation of the frontier. A settlement was reached in 1925. A tripartite agreement was signed by the three governments of the Irish Free State, Northern Ireland and the United Kingdom.

This agreement was registered with the League of Nations (the predecessor of the United Nations) and approved by the legislatures of the three signatory countries. It provided for the maintenance of the existing frontier, for a financial settlement between Dublin and London and for mutual recognition, mutual consultation and mutual co-operation as between the Dublin and Belfast governments. The agreement was drafted in terms of unusual cordiality which reflected the spirit in which it was negotiated, and it recorded the determination of the signatory governments "mutually to aid one another in a spirit of neighbourly comradeship."





The expression "partition" has often been used in an adverse sense about this agreement. As the result of southern Ireland's secession, that which was "partitioned" was the United Kingdom, just as the U.S.A. would have been partitioned if the Confederates had succeeded in the 1860's. The arrangement that was reached was freely negotiated. It represented the genuine wishes of those concerned. And the three governments were solemnly pledged to the resulting settlement.

### ***Broken Pledges and a False Claim***

Unhappily, when the government of Mr. De Valera came to power in 1932, it unilaterally broke this and other agreements to which its country had been pledged. In 1937 the Dublin government went further and adopted a constitution in which it laid claim to sovereignty over Northern Ireland, in breach of several major previous undertakings.

This claim has continued to be maintained in the Republic's constitution, although in various subsequent international agreements, such as the Treaty of Rome, the Republic's government has also given full formal recognition to "the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland", implying the invalidity of its own claim. The Republic were also a signatory to the Helsinki Agreements of 1975 in which the participating governments undertook to refrain from making territorial claims on other signatory countries, which in this case included the United Kingdom. In flagrant breach of its repeatedly given undertakings, the Republic has continued to make this unlawful claim.

The claim to sovereignty over Northern Ireland provided an ideological umbrella which gave shelter to several campaigns of terrorist outrages against the people of Northern Ireland, directed and organised from within the Republic.

### ***The Irish Republic in World War II***

The Republic remained strictly neutral during World War II, a heavy burden upon the Allies. It would not have been possible for the Allies to carry this burden and endure this handicap had not Northern Ireland, as part of the United Kingdom and by the positive will of its inhabitants, been available to provide strategic air cover for the western approaches.

Northern Ireland also provided a bridgehead for the arrival of the United States Forces to be deployed in the European theatre of war. General Eisenhower, the future President, commented on this —

"Without Northern Ireland I do not see how the American forces could have been concentrated to begin the invasion of Europe. If Ulster had not been a definite, co-operative part of the British Empire and had not been available for our use I do not see how the build-up could have been carried out in England."

A German legation remained in Dublin throughout the war, and, with Nazi approval, attempts were made by proponents of Irish republicanism to damage and disrupt the British and American war effort in Ulster. These attempts were completely frustrated by the vigilance of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the Ulster Special Constabulary. Over eighty secret terrorist accumulations of arms and ammunition were uncovered in Northern Ireland during the war, and those who had hoped to use them apprehended.

Towards the close of the war, Mr. De Valera was the only head of government in the world to go personally to convey his country's official condolences on the death of Hitler, which he did at the German legation in Dublin in 1945.



*De Valera.*



*Hitler.*

## ***Economic and Social Effects of the Republic's Secession***

From 1950 the Irish Republic ceased to be a member of the British Commonwealth. It was running into increasingly grave difficulties as the result of its severance from the rest of the United Kingdom. So poor and backward had it become that, over a long period of years, out of every two children born in the Republic, one had to emigrate. Although its population was twice that of Northern Ireland, its exports were for several decades less than half the value of those of Northern Ireland, and its social services were gravely inferior.

In 1972, after fifty years of southern Irish secession, an Irish economist, reviewing its position, estimated that if the Republic had remained within the United Kingdom instead of seceding, its national income would have been between 25 and 40 per cent. higher.

The Republic staggered into the 1980's with the highest burden of debt per head of its population of any country in the European Community. As an independent state it is a failed political entity.

It is notorious that, when a country is in serious economic and social difficulties, its government tends to distract attention by pursuing outside issues. Dublin governments have tended to use their claim to Northern Ireland for this purpose.

## ***Sour Aspects of "Neighbourly Comradeship"***

The terrorist campaign which has been waged for twelve years against the people of Northern Ireland has been directed from a headquarters across the frontier in the Irish Republic. The Republic's government dare not give scope or encouragement to these terrorist activities. It is too vulnerable itself, and it knows that the terrorists have become linked to international Marxist movements which would be glad to see Ireland transformed into a Cuba or a Vietnam. But it has been ready to let the terrorists serve as its political hatchetmen against the people of Ulster.

A very high proportion of the murders, bombings and other atrocities have involved the use of the Republic's territory, as a base from which explosions can be set off by distant control or from which raids can be made across the frontier or as a refuge for those who perpetrated atrocities in Northern Ireland.

Those who commit these atrocities are given protection in the Republic where, at the close of 1981, there were 600 persons enjoying



their liberty whom the police in Northern Ireland would have wished to question about serious offences; and there was substantial evidence against a high proportion of them.

In view of this discreditable record, it can be understood that most people in Northern Ireland cannot feel that the Republic has honoured its 1925 resolve to act "in a spirit of neighbourly comradeship" towards them; and many of them regard it quite unequivocally as an enemy country.

**Why Ulster People  
will not join  
the Irish Republic**

# Why Ulster People will not join the Irish Republic

*People who do not know and who are remote from the realities of the Ulster scene have sometimes lightly asked why Ulster people should not join in one republic with their southern neighbours. To those who live in Ulster and know their own minds and know the circumstances that confront them, the question perhaps seems foolish. The answer seems so very obvious to them. But to people at a distance this is not always obvious. The question is a fair one and ought to be given a fair answer.*

## **Differences of Temperament and Choice**

When people ask why Northern Ireland does not join the Irish Republic they might also ask why Portugal does not join Spain or why Norway does not again become part of Sweden or put a similar question about any of a number of other examples of contiguous countries which do not amalgamate. The answer in such cases usually is that the people are different and prefer to do their own thing and carry on as separate communities.

People in Northern Ireland do feel different from their neighbours in the Republic. When American-born Professor Richard Rose conducted an extensive survey of Ulster people's attitudes in 1968, he found that two thirds of those who responded to enquiries thought themselves to be "much different" from people of the same religion as themselves in England or in the Irish Republic. A still larger proportion regarded other

Ulster people of different religious affiliation from themselves as "about the same" as themselves. There is a strong sense of shared Ulster identity right through the community. In fact there is an Ulster national feeling.

In another chapter, entitled 'Ulster — a Distinct British Entity', the historical process, by which a distinctive modern Ulster national identity emerged, has been sketched. Sometimes the joining of Northern Ireland with the Republic has been referred to as the "reunification" of Ireland. But these two countries have never been joined together in a modern political sense except under British rule. When that uniting factor was ended and the Irish Republic seceded from the United Kingdom, there was nothing more to keep the two countries together.

## **Two Wars**

The fact that people in the Republic and in Northern Ireland have taken such very different attitudes and made such very different political choices demonstrates their separate identities and the fact that they are two very different peoples. That Ulster stood by the Allies in two World Wars and made grave sacrifices in both, while the Republic built its political traditions round what was essentially a pro-German rebellion in World War I, and stayed neutral in World War II in a way that hindered the Allies and was helpful to the Nazis, is significant of a difference of psychological orientation in the peoples of these two small countries.

## **Industry**

This historic difference of attitude has come out in other matters as well as political choice. Northern Ireland turned to industry long before Southern Ireland took its industrial opportunities seriously. There was no reason, apart from the people, why shipbuilding, engineering and textile industries should have become established in Ulster rather than in the south in the 19th century. Here again there was this difference of temperament and aptitudes.

## **Broken Undertakings**

Although there were marked differences, there was no pronounced wish in Northern Ireland to take any attitude of hostility towards the south. The Tripartite Agreement of 1925, by which the Dublin and Belfast governments agreed on mutual recognition, co-operation and



consultation and recorded their resolve "mutually to aid one another in a spirit of neighbourly comradeship", was brought about largely through the personal efforts of Lord Craigavon, the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland. And he and his successors tried to act in the spirit of that agreement even when the Republic did not.

They met, however, with bad faith and much hostility from Dublin. The government of Mr. De Valera cynically tore up the 1925 agreement, as well as other treaties and undertakings, and laid claim to sovereignty over Northern Ireland. Under the pretext of that claim a succession of terrorist campaigns were waged against the people of Northern Ireland by underground movements with headquarters in the Republic. Mr De Valera urged that those in Northern Ireland who did not accept his kind of united Ireland should be subjected to mass deportation to Britain.

### ***Violence and Attitudes Towards It***

Ulster people might dismiss, with good humour and no hard feelings, attempts to woo or seduce them politically; but their feelings have certainly hardened against brutal attempts at rape.

The long campaign of lies and smearing which came from the Republic has not passed unnoticed among Ulster people. In theory the attitude of successive Dublin governments has been to deplore acts of violence committed by the I.R.A. and other Republican terrorist bodies; but this violence has had widespread support through the community in the Republic. An opinion survey under the auspices of the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin found that, in 1979, 20.7 per cent of respondents in the Republic approved of the activities of the I.R.A. and 41.8 per cent sympathised with its motives. Such a pervasive sympathy with the perpetrators of atrocities against Ulster people leaves little scope for confidence in the Republic's readiness to impose effective curbs on terrorism.

Terrorists have certainly not been curbed. They have operated repeatedly across the frontier from the Republic's territory. The Republic has at all times refused to extradite persons wanted in Northern Ireland to face serious charges of complicity in terrorist acts. On the other hand Ulster courts have consistently practised extradition handing over wanted criminals to the Republic. At the close of 1981, 600 individuals whom the police in Northern Ireland wanted to question, and against many of whom there was substantial evidence, were living in unquestioned freedom in the Republic.

The whole attitude of successive Dublin governments to the keeping of solemn undertakings freely given in the past, and to these campaigns of terrorism, has caused many Ulster people to regard the Irish Republic not just as an alien and foreign country but as an enemy country.

### ***Religion***

One of the ways in which a difference of temperament between the two countries has historically shown itself has been in religion. Northern Ireland is predominantly Protestant. The Roman Catholic part of the community, however, has expanded greatly in numbers and prosperity under the Northern Ireland government and was helped to achieve a high degree of upward social mobility, so that, in 1971 the census of population made in each country showed that a higher proportion of the Roman Catholic population in Northern Ireland were in professional and managerial employments than was the case in the Republic.



*Cardinal Tomas O'Fiaich, who insists upon Southern Ireland imposing Catholic Moral Standards upon its Protestant community — divorce and birth control facilities are not available — the Gaelic Language is compulsory.*

In the Irish Republic, however, the country was specifically declared by Mr. De Valera to be a Catholic nation. Although a Protestant urban middle class has a strong position in the professions and in business, heavy social pressures and discrimination have driven Protestants largely out of small farming and manual occupations. The 1971 census showed a marked diminution in their numbers in 19 out of 25 categories of employment. Their numbers have been halved since the Irish Free State was set up at the beginning of the 1920's. Their birthrate was quite adequate to maintain their numbers, but a high proportion of their younger age groups emigrated because of discrimination in employment.

It is natural for Ulster people of the various Protestant denominations, who have seen their co-religionists halved in the Republic, by what has been described as "kidglove genocide", to conclude that the Republic is not a country in which they would want to live.

The predominantly sectarian character of much legislation in the Republic discriminates against non-Roman Catholics. They are denied divorce, free access to the purchase of contraceptives, access to non-secretarian education and to uncensored literature.

The political and religious traditions and symbols round which the national identity of the Irish Republic has been built are quite alien to Ulster. Some of them have positively hostile implications for Ulster people. Others are simply foreign and meaningless. One such symbol has been the artificial and compulsory maintenance of the Gaelic language for official purposes, though it has almost completely died out as a living speech. Yet it has been and still is a compulsory requirement to have a fluency in Gaelic in order to be considered for employment in the Republic's Civil Service or Security Forces. Ulster also has its own traditions, less aggressively imposed on the population at large, but probably rather devoid of interest for citizens of the Republic.

### ***The Economics of Secession***

The Irish Republic's secession from the United Kingdom has been in many ways a disaster for its inhabitants. As an independent state the Republic has been a failed political entity. In 1972, after fifty years of isolationism and independence, it was estimated that its national income would have been between 25 and 40 per cent higher if it had remained part of the United Kingdom. Only emigration on a relatively enormous scale has prevented total collapse. Its balance of payments position is extremely adverse; there is a very high inflation rate and low



*Ulster's positive loyalties.*



productivity, and it has a bigger burden of debt per head of its population than any other member of the European Community, in spite of having had an almost clean slate to start with, no wars to fight, much help from Britain in terms of employment, defence, trade and tourism and quite a lot of good will throughout the world. For Ulster people to join the Republic would be to join economic hopelessness and a huge debt.

### ***Positive Loyalties***

There is finally the fundamental nature of the Republic's secession from the United Kingdom and from the Commonwealth. To both, a large section of the community in Ulster has strong and positive loyalties. They do not wish to abandon their allegiance or change their nationality. Such a reluctance is not peculiar to Ulster. People feel that way about their country and its loyalties in most parts of the world.

## **How Ulster People Think and Vote**

## How Ulster People Think and Vote

*It is frequently said that the problems of Ulster must be solved by Ulster people themselves, though in recent years they have not been permitted to do this. A study of voting trends, however, shows that there need be no doubt as to what Ulster people have always wished and always striven to achieve. Parliamentary voting in Northern Ireland was based on the same system of franchise as voting in Britain. The votes cast in elections show two basic long-term tendencies. One has been increasing support for the Union with Britain, the other an increasing dissociation of political attitudes from religious affiliation. The figures speak for themselves.*

### **The Accuracy of Election Results**

Two sets of parliamentary voting figures are available from Northern Ireland. One series of elections was concerned with electing twelve members to the United Kingdom Parliament at Westminster. For this the electoral boundaries were regulated from Westminster and were not locally controlled in any way. Another series of voting results come from elections to the Northern Ireland legislature. For this the constituency boundaries were established by the Parliament of Northern Ireland in 1929 and left unchanged until a very few adjustments were made to respond to population changes at the close of the 1960's.

Because in some cases they got out of date in relation to population, it was repeatedly claimed that the electoral divisions for the Northern Ireland parliamentary elections were "gerrymandered" to give advantage to Unionists. That this was untrue can be shown by the simple fact that

in practice they gave substantial advantage to Irish Republican and Nationalist candidates.

In all the Northern Ireland general elections from 1929 to 1969 inclusive, Unionists received on average 62.2 per cent of the votes and 69.1 per cent of the contested seats, while Republicans and Nationalists averaged 14.6 per cent of the votes and got 18.7 per cent of the contested seats. The remaining votes went to Labour, Independents and others. In ratio of seats to votes, the Republicans and Nationalist candidates were 15 per cent ahead of the Unionist and they still had an advantage when uncontested seats were taken into account.

The main reason for charges of "gerrymandering" was that those who made the charges wanted to explain away their own lack of success at elections. The real cause of their poor electoral showing was that people were simply not voting for them.

### **A Change in Opinion**

In the first general election held for a Northern Ireland legislature in 1921, candidates committed to supporting the Union received 66.9 per cent of the first preference votes. Candidates committed to opposing the Union received 32.3 per cent. This is roughly two-thirds to one-third.

But, as the successful policies of the devolved government of Northern Ireland took effect, and as the disastrous effects of southern Ireland's secession from the United Kingdom became increasingly visible, voting against the Union steadily dwindled. At the last general election for a Northern Ireland legislature, held in 1973, 74.7 per cent of the first preference went to candidates committed to the Union, roughly three-quarters.

The elections for Westminster provided at first less information about opinion in Ulster because a high proportion of the seats were not contested until after World War II. In 1955 Unionist and Sinn Féin candidates contested all twelve seats, Unionists getting 68.5 per cent of the votes and Sinn Féin 23.5 per cent. In 1959, however, a similar set of contests gave 77.2 per cent of the votes to Unionists and only 11 per cent to Sinn Féin. In 1964 Unionists and Republicans contested all twelve seats and Labour contested ten of them. Unionists received 63 per cent of the votes, Labour 16.1 and Republicans 15.9.

In the election in 1979 for the European Assembly, 73.14 per cent of the cumulative votes went to candidates specifically committed to the Union. Not all the other candidates were declaredly committed to uniting Northern Ireland with the Republic.



## **1973 Referendum — Overwhelming Support for British Link**

An election, of course involves many issues. People are also often attached to a particular political party for a wide variety of social and other reasons. In many Northern Ireland elections the maintenance of the Union, though always in the background, has not been an issue of immediate significance and voting has been influenced by other considerations. It is therefore of interest to look at those occasions when opinion is elicited on the single issue of the Union in isolation from all other issues.

In 1973 an opportunity was given to all voters in Northern Ireland to express their wishes on this single issue in a referendum. They were asked whether they wanted Northern Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom or to be joined with the Irish Republic outside the United Kingdom. In the outcome, 98.92 per cent of those voting supported the Union, while 1.08 per cent voted for the Republic.

Account has to be taken of the fact that a boycott of the poll was enforced in some areas by incidents of violence on the day when voting took place. But even if the highest electoral turn out ever recorded in Northern Ireland under the present franchise had occurred that day, a turn-out of 72 per cent of the whole electorate instead of the 58 per cent who did turn out and vote, and if, as is wildly improbable, all the extra votes had favoured the Republic, it would still have meant that less than a fifth of the votes would have gone against the Union.

## **Opinion Surveys**

What was shown by the referendum of 1973 was confirmed by private or commercial opinion polls and surveys. Early in 1973 a newspaper, the *Belfast Telegraph*, commissioned an independent opinion poll which found that virtually no Protestants and only 39 per cent of all Roman Catholic respondents supported the option of "a united Ireland". At the beginning of 1976 the Belfast newspaper, *Sunday News*, asked for a vote from its broad and politically disparate readership and found that only 13.8 per cent of all the votes supported a "united Ireland".

Under university auspices an "attitude survey" was made in 1978 and proposed various political options to respondents. Options involving uniting Northern Ireland with the Irish Republic, either federally or under one government, were regarded as the most acceptable by only 16.9 per cent of all respondents and by 39.1 per cent of all Roman Catholic respondents.

From the various voting and other figures given here, two fundamental facts are apparent. One is that three-quarters — probably four-fifths — of the people want Northern Ireland to remain in the Union with Great Britain. This is the over-all national choice of the Ulster people; and to try to push them by violence or political intrigue in a contrary direction is to invite unending conflict.

## **Religion and Politics**

The second fact that emerges is that political choice and religious affiliation, though they overlap, are not to be equated. The 1926 census of population showed that Roman Catholics were 33.5 per cent of the population in Northern Ireland, the rest belonging to various Protestant bodies. In 1971 many people did not answer the optional question on religious affiliation on the census form; but projections from the past and from family patterns produced general agreement that the Roman Catholic percentage had reached 36.8 per cent in 1971.

Taking the 1926 figure as 100, we have here an upward swing of 9.85 per cent in the proportion of the population that is Roman Catholic. If we similarly contrast the voting for the first and last Northern Ireland legislatures, 66.9 per cent for the Union in 1921 and 74.7 per cent in 1973, we have an upward swing of 11.66 per cent in relative voting support for the Union.

The correlation between the increased number of Roman Catholics and the increased proportion of votes going to support the Union, together with some of the figures previously given, shows the falsity of the widely propagated notion that all Roman Catholics want to have Northern Ireland disconnected from the United Kingdom and amalgamated with the Irish Republic.



**Left:** Ulster at the ballot box.

**Below:** The I.R.A. oppose the ballot box and democracy. Security is now provided at many polling stations to guarantee right of citizens to exercise their franchise.



## ***Voting and Violence***

The main reason for the employment of violence in Ulster seems to have been the fact that by the 1960's the Irish Republican cause was clearly losing its hold on the Roman Catholic floating vote. It has been a "floating" vote, for, within the long-term trends already described, it has shown itself liable to large volatile swings. Rejected decisively by the electorate and with no prospect of reversing in their own favour the trend that was setting in, Irish Republican activists became ready to grasp anything that might destabilise the situation that confronted them. They were allowed to succeed too well.

A major part of their present strategy is to represent conflict in Ulster as solely sectarian, and to claim that there are "two communities" in Ulster. The object is to gather Roman Catholic voters as far as possible into one ideological camp.

For those who do not let themselves be gathered in by propaganda and the creation of prejudice against their neighbours, more forceful methods of coercion are available under a reign of terrorism which, apart from murders, bombings and burnings, has carried out a thousand "kneecappings" and other forms of physical maiming.

## ***Community Attitudes***

While it is true that members of one religious denomination may to some extent form a "community", it should be remembered that a "Protestant" in Ulster simply means a professing Christian who is not a Roman Catholic; and non-Roman Catholics are no more to be regarded as one coherent "community" than, say, non-Presbyterians or non-Methodists. Talk of "two communities" or "two traditions" is quite unrealistic.

When American-born Professor Richard Rose conducted an extended investigation into Ulster attitudes in 1968, just before trouble began, he found that 81 per cent of Protestants respondents to his enquiries and 83 per cent of Roman Catholic respondents said that relations between people of their respective affiliations in the districts where they had grown up were "very good" or "fairly good". The overwhelming majority of both groups thought that Ulster people of different religion from themselves were "about the same" as themselves. And 66 per cent



of the Protestants thought that their co-religionists in England were "much different" from themselves, while exactly the same proportion of Roman Catholics had the same feeling about their co-religionists in the Irish Republic. There was thus a strong sense of having a shared Ulster identity, regardless of religious affiliation, and a feeling of the somewhat alien character of people from Britain or the Republic.

There are few things that render the proponents of Irish Republicanism more contemptible than their efforts to stress religious differences, to segregate people of different Christian denominations and to beat up religious misunderstandings and quarrels. Many outside observers of the Ulster scene have been confused by these efforts; but the facts stand out in the figures here given. There is a strong Ulster identity or sense of nationality, and an overwhelming majority of the Ulster people are resolutely opposed to merging it in the Irish Republic.

## **The Government of Northern Ireland: The Falsehoods and the Facts**

# The Government of Northern Ireland: The Falsehoods and the Facts

*The devolved government of Northern Ireland which functioned from 1921 to 1972 was open, democratic, efficient, economical and successful. It was just in its treatment of all sections of the community. Its record of performance has been the subject of very extreme depreciative allegations which can quite simply be shown up as lies.*

## **The Government of Northern Ireland**

During half a century the internal affairs of Northern Ireland were under the control of its own devolved parliament and government, within the United Kingdom. Its external affairs were looked after by the United Kingdom government.

This half century saw an immense increase in the prosperity of Northern Ireland and a 20 per cent increase in its population. Every section of the community benefited, particularly any who had formerly been at a disadvantage.

Since they formed a majority in the electorate and in the parliament, Unionists formed the government. Although they were united in their support for the Union with Britain, Unionists differed on many other matters; and Unionist governments tended to be coalitions of groups and individuals who represented somewhat varying points of view.

Their power was limited by their financial arrangement within the United Kingdom. Northern Ireland paid the same taxes as the rest of the United Kingdom and received from the United Kingdom Exchequer an annual sum of money calculated to enable the Northern Ireland

government to maintain the services which it administered at the same standard as the corresponding services in Britain.

This left the Northern Ireland government little scope for policies involving expenditures greater or different in any marked degree from the levels and objectives of government expenditure in Britain. But there remained much freedom of administrative method and approach. This freedom for administrative experiment and innovation was fully taken advantage of, and schemes were developed to improve agriculture and agricultural marketing, attract a diversity of new industries and improve various public services.

## **Irish Republican Propaganda**

In many fields the achievements of Northern Ireland's devolved government constituted a success story, but it was constantly under attack from proponents of Republican separatism. Some of this attack took the form of actual physical violence and occasional acts of terrorism, but much of it was in the form of lying propaganda, most of which took the form of allegations of oppression, corruption or impropriety on the part of the Northern Ireland government. What follows is a brief record of the main allegations and of the actual facts.

## **Voting Rights**

It was repeatedly alleged that in some way Roman Catholics did not have the same voting rights as other people. In fact the franchise was the same as in Britain. All adults had votes. Votes were given to all women and later to all persons of 18 years and upwards when the same changes were made in Britain.

It was alleged that constituencies were "gerrymandered" to the advantage of the Unionist party. The allegation of "gerrymandering" is common to most Western democracies but in fact in Ulster the constituency boundaries were somewhat disadvantageous to Unionists. They were left for a long period of time unchanged, and gradual alterations in the population made them distinctly advantageous to the opponents of the Union.

Omitting the abolished university constituency, Unionists in all general elections for the Northern Ireland parliament, from 1929 to 1969 inclusive, averaged 62.2 per cent of the votes and secured 69.1 per cent of the contested parliamentary seats, while Irish Nationalist and



Republican candidates averaged only 14.6 per cent of the votes and gained 18.7 per cent of the seats. In the ratio of seats to votes the system allowed the Nationalist and Republican candidates a 15 per cent advantage over the Unionists.

Local government boundaries had been fixed in 1923 and remained fixed for nearly half a century, during which time changes in population rendered them very out-of-date, particularly since population had not been the sole criterion in determining the boundaries under the obsolescent system then prevailing in the United Kingdom. This produced some outstanding anomalies, but the general effect was to favour the opponents of the Union. When local government elections were held in 1973 with new boundaries, a proportional voting system and the same franchise as in parliamentary elections, Unionist candidates gained control of a higher proportion of the councils than they had had previously in 1967 under the unrevised system.

Comparison of results shows that in both parliamentary and local council elections there was always a substantially higher degree of proportionality between votes cast and seats won in Northern Ireland than in Great Britain, and that in general the advantage lay with the opponents of the ruling Unionist party.

An emotive slogan "One man, one vote", much used in 1968, referred only to the fact that voting in local council elections was confined to occupiers of rateable property and their spouses, a system which prevailed until recently in Britain and in other countries. This meant that only three-quarters (73.74 per cent) of parliamentary voters had local government votes. There is no evidence that this favoured any particular political, social or religious group. When the parliamentary and local government franchises were made identical it did not seem to make much difference in election results apart from a slight swing in favour of Unionists.

## Housing

It has been widely alleged that Roman Catholics were discriminated against in the allocation of public authority housing. The 1971 census of population made it possible to collate religious affiliation with information about housing conditions. The results showed that, in proportion to their numbers, Roman Catholic households had been 25 per cent more generously provided with public authority housing than their Protestant neighbours. Their advantage in this respect had not,



*Typical housing development for Roman Catholics — the Poleglass housing estate just outside Belfast.*

moreover, been offset by any marked inferiority in their accommodation in other respects. In 1980-81 in the City of Belfast £13,000,000 was spent in Roman Catholic areas while only £7,000,000 was spent in Protestant areas. Yet Roman Catholic areas comprise only one third of the city.


## Employment

It was alleged that Roman Catholics had been discriminated against in employment. The 1971 census of population showed that at that time 94.4 per cent of the Protestant work force was in employment and 86.1 per cent of the Roman Catholic work force. This would mean that it had been about one-twelfth more difficult for a Roman Catholic to find employment, a significant but not a large difference.

The difference can be mathematically accounted for by the social habits and geographical distribution of Roman Catholics in Ulster and without any need to suppose the existence of a significant factor of discrimination. In particular, unemployment affects young workers more severely than older workers and is therefore more prevalent in social groups which have a higher birthrate and a higher proportion of young people, as is distinctly the case among Ulster's Roman Catholic population. Size of family has also other effects on achievement in the



*One of the Roman Catholic Teachers' Training Colleges, funded by the Government of Northern Ireland.*



*One of the many Roman Catholic Schools for which finance is provided out of public funds.*

employment market, including earlier withdrawal from education in many cases and more frequent involvement in "dead end" jobs.

Direct evidence of discrimination has not been forthcoming. A Fair Employment Agency, set up to expose cases of such discrimination, discovered only eight proven cases in three years.

Comparison with the census of the Irish Republic showed that in 1971 the proportion of the Roman Catholic population in professional and managerial employment was higher in Northern Ireland than in the Republic.

## **Education**

In its administration of public services, the Unionist government of Northern Ireland served every section of the community fairly and treated the special needs of Roman Catholics with exceptional generosity. In particular, 95 per cent of the cost of a separate Roman Catholic education system, parallel with the non-sectarian education system provided for others, was met out of public funds, a concession not available in Britain, the U.S.A. or any other country with a population of similarly mixed religious affiliation.

## **Security**

Another area of complaint was the security measures which had to be taken against acts of disruptive terrorist violence committed by Republican activists. The measures adopted to combat terrorism were in fact much milder and more moderate than those used in nearly any other country afflicted with this kind of trouble. The Dublin government had used a policy of putting many of those arrested to death, often for relatively minor offences. The Northern Ireland government used internment, from which it released those prepared to give credible undertakings of good behaviour. By law the the police force in Northern Ireland was restricted in numbers to 3,000. These were assisted by a part-time auxiliary force which patrolled roads and fulfilled similar tasks for which extended numbers of personnel were sometimes needed, particularly in frontier areas.

## **Government Performance**

At the close of World War I Northern Ireland had been an area poorer than the Irish Republic in its economic condition and prospects. It had



more unemployment, smaller farms, fewer people with higher education qualifications, and a worse record in public health. Its few major industries — shipbuilding, textiles and agriculture — were all suffering from recession. Yet under the administration of Unionist governments it moved rapidly ahead of the adjacent Irish Republic.

The value of Northern Ireland exports came to be more than twice the value of the Republic's exports, though the Republic had twice Northern Ireland's population. Its emigration rate was less than half that of the Republic. Its education services, schemes of re-industrialisation and range of employment opportunities, its social services and welfare systems, were all vastly superior to what was available to people in the Republic. In these improvements in opportunity and in the quality of living, every section of the community participated, Roman Catholics being advantaged more than others.

### **Cost**

One final untruth about Northern Ireland needs to be dismissed. It has been repeatedly alleged that the government of Northern Ireland was maintained only at great cost to the United Kingdom government and taxpayer.

This was investigated by the Royal Commission on the Constitution, 1969-73. It was found that Northern Ireland, with its own devolved government, was administered at substantially less cost to the United Kingdom Exchequer than Wales or Scotland, proportionately to the populations of these countries. In a normal year, 1964-5, when public expenditure on Northern Ireland per head of the population was 2 per cent higher than in England, it was respectively 16 and 17 per cent higher in Scotland and Wales.

## **Devolved Government in Ulster**



*The last State Opening of Ulster's Devolved Parliament.*

## Devolved Government in Ulster

Until 1972 the Government of Northern Ireland was unique within the United Kingdom. Basically Britain is what is called a unitary state.

Government and law making are centralised, there is only the one Parliament and one Executive responsible to it. In this Britain differs from most other countries of similar size. They often have federal systems or extensive legislative and administrative devolution — that is systems whereby there are a series of local or state legislatures and executives with certain powers and then a national or federal legislature exercising the major functions that relate to the country as a whole. Australia, Canada, Germany, Italy, the United States all are examples of states with federal systems or extensive devolution.

In the United Kingdom devolution existed only with regard to Northern Ireland. The 1920 Settlement created a local legislature for the six counties of Northern Ireland. A similar legislature was created for the twenty six counties of Southern Ireland, but following the 1921 Treaty Southern Ireland became virtually independent as the Irish Free State (later changing its name to the Republic of Ireland).

### ***The 1920 Settlement***

The Settlement created by the Government of Ireland Act 1920 was a compromise between the claims of Irish Nationalism and Ulster Unionism. Like any compromise there can be argument about whether the arrangement should have leaned a little more to one side or the other, but there can be no doubt but that to allow the claims of either party to triumph over the other would have been a breach of the principle of self determination. Irish Nationalists were only a small minority within the United Kingdom (less than 10 per cent!) They claimed the right to secede from the kingdom on the grounds that they had a culture and



national identity different from the rest of the Country. Exactly the same principles justified the separation of the Ulster minority in the Island of Ireland (which constituted nearly twenty-five percent of the population) from the new state which the Irish Nationalists wanted to create.

The 1920 Act did not merely recognise a division within the Island which existed before the Act, it created a Parliament and Government specifically for Northern Ireland. This Parliament was subordinate to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. It only had power to deal with internal matters and so was similar to state legislatures in the United States, Canada and Australia. It was hoped that this arrangement would settle the "Irish problem" and keep what had been a very divisive issue out of the Westminster Parliament.

**It is very important to realise that for fifty years this settlement actually worked! That half century was a period of increasing prosperity for all the people of Northern Ireland!** No matter what criterion you use, in 1971 the people were better off, better housed, better fed, more healthy, and better educated; and this holds true even if you compare the experience of Northern Ireland with that of the Irish Republic.

## **Major Changes**

In the seventies two significant changes occurred. The first concerned local Government, the second, the local Parliament. For many years it had been recognised that local Government needed an overhaul. There were some 78 different County and Town Authorities for a small population, moreover in certain significant ways we were "out of step" with the rest of the United Kingdom (we still had a ratepayers franchise for the county and town councils, which had been abolished in England in 1948). In the sixties a number of Committees were set up to consider reorganisation. In 1970 the Macrory Committees (so called after its Chairman) recommended sweeping changes. All significant local services — planning, roads, education, health and personal social services were to be centralised. (Housing had already been centralised). This meant that the new local Authorities, the District Councils, would be mainly advisory — their functions being limited to minor matters such as sweeping the streets and burying the dead. Democratic control of the services which had been centralised would be provided by the Stormont Parliament. These changes were intended to increase the efficiency of

the main services and also remove a possible cause of grievance. **Virtually all the criticism of administrations in Ulster had concentrated on the local councils. It was generally agreed that services administered by Stormont had been administered fairly.**

## **Democracy Overthrown**

Then the real blow fell. In 1972, acting simply as a result of expediency and pressure from terrorists and others, Edward Heath the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, first prorogued and then abolished the Stormont Parliament.

He was able to do this because the United Kingdom has no written constitution. There is no constitution guaranteeing the liberties of the individual or "state rights". Britain is what Lord Hailsham, the current Lord Chancellor, has called an "elective dictatorship". When Heath abolished democratic government in Northern Ireland he was exercising the dictatorial powers that can reside at Westminster. He broke what had been regarded as a convention of the constitution, by interfering in matters within the competence of Stormont without its consent. But there is in Britain no supreme court with the power to pronounce on these matters. It seems that there are actions which are "unconstitutional" yet cannot be made the subject of a legal challenge.

This precipitous act did not merely deprive us of our legislature — it swept away all vestiges of local democracy. For just as the Macrory Report was being implemented, and local services were being transferred to Stormont, Stormont disappeared.

## **Direct Rule**

The result is that all services of any significance in Ulster are now directly administered from Westminster. This is the system called "Direct Rule". The local administration still exists but it is directed by Westminster politicians who are appointed directly from England and are not answerable to any electorate in Northern Ireland. **Local legislation is still enacted by Executive "Orders" which can only be debated at Westminster for a maximum of ninety minutes and cannot be amended!**


This state of affairs has been acknowledged by all to be most unsatisfactory. It was excused originally as being just a "temporary provision", but this temporary provision still exists.



**Top left:** Rt. Hon. William Whitelaw.

**Top right:** Rt. Hon. Francis Pym.

**Left:** Rt. Hon. Merlyn Rees.



**Top left:** Rt. Hon. Roy Mason.

**Top right:** Rt. Hon. Humphrey Atkins.

**Right:** Rt. Hon. Jim Prior.



**In the past ten years these six men have been imposed upon Ulster as its rulers without seeking electoral support or consent within the Province.**



Throughout all these ten years from 1972 the citizens of Northern Ireland have been prevented from exercising any democratic control on their own affairs. Only two avenues exist for legitimate political action, the District Councils and the few members returned to the Westminster Parliament. The District Councils have no real powers, they can only make representations. Their value can be illustrated by referring to two matters. A couple of years ago Cookstown District Council had occasion to complain of the provisions for consultation on planning matters. The Government officials who came to the Council Meeting to hear the Council's discussions on planning, would, it was said, sit at the back of the meeting and snigger at the Councillor's statements. In protest at the wave of I.R.A. murders which culminated in the assassination of the Rev. Robert Bradford M.P., Unionist Councillors have adopted a policy of adjourning the Councils without transacting any business. So for some time now the majority of the District Councils have been doing nothing. This is, in effect, a boycott of local Government. The administration of the Province has continued. The District Councils stand revealed as a sham, an imitation of local democracy.

### ***Democracy Stifled***

Nor are things any better when you consider representation in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. At present Northern Ireland returns 12 members to a body consisting of 635 members. The arithmetic alone reveals how little chance Ulster M.Ps. have of affecting policy. The matter is worse when you discover that there is a bipartisan policy on Northern Ireland. That is an agreement between the leadership of the Conservative Party and the leadership of the Labour Party. **The main object of bipartisanship is to prevent meaningful discussion of Ulster policy on the floor of the House of Commons and so prevent the Ulster M.Ps. from exercising any influence on that policy.**

This determination to stymie the Ulster representatives is carried to ridiculous lengths in the Northern Ireland Committee of the House of Commons. The Committee was established in response to the demands of the Ulster M.Ps. But to keep control of it, the Government determines when it shall meet and what it shall debate when it meets! If that is not sufficient to control the Committee then the Government can rely on the 20 members from other parts of the United Kingdom who are added to the Committee to ensure that all the Ulster M.Ps. are in a minority.

### ***Reforming Direct Rule?***

Sometimes it is suggested that Unionists should concentrate on improving the Direct Rule system. Indeed there was a minor success for this approach when, during the last years of the Callaghan administration it was agreed to increase the number of Ulster Representatives to ensure parity of representation.

The background to this is as follows, before the First World War Northern Ireland returned 25 members to Westminster, after the War the figure should have risen on redistribution to around 30 but because of the establishment of a local Parliament it was decided to cut representation to 12. By the mid-seventies this under-representation was indefensible. Our taxation and our services were determined by a body in which we were under-represented. Against the protests of Dublin, the S.D.L.P. and their sympathisers this injustice was remedied by providing for an increase to 17 members. This is virtually the representation obtained by applying the United Kingdom electoral quota to the Northern Ireland electorate. It takes no account of remoteness or any other factor. Scotland and Wales are deliberately over represented at Westminster to take account of these factors and Northern Ireland would be entitled to 21 members on the same basis. But no such generosity was shown to Northern Ireland.

### ***The Need for Devolution***

This spirit of meanness which seems to persuade the modern British politician's attitude to what is part of his own country has confirmed Ulster Unionists in their desire for the restoration of a meaningful system of devolution. This desire is reinforced by the practical disadvantages of even a reformed direct rule. The Ulster M.Ps. workload would be higher, for he has to deal with what ought to be local Government matters as well as his usual parliamentary business. Moreover he has a time and distance problem. Although not quite the most remote from London, travel from Ulster is made burdensome because of the channel crossing and the poor quality of the services. Two other countries have greater distances to cope with, but they all have meaningful devolution or federal systems.

The desire for devolution in Ulster is universal. It crosses all political boundaries. All the major parties, (Alliance, Democratic Unionist, S.D.L.P. and Ulster Unionist) are in favour of it and virtually all the minor parties.

**There is no disagreement about the advantages of devolution.**

There are disagreements about the structure of a Devolved Government and the way in which it should be restored but that is another matter

## ***The Benefits of Devolution***

Why is devolution desired? First it leads to a more efficient administration. Decisions can be obtained quickly and the citizen does not have to go so far to find the civil servant responsible for a particular matter. In the past this was a great advantage when it came to decisions on investment.

Secondly, devolution makes possible local legislation which reflects local attitudes. Religion plays a greater part in Ulster life than in the rest of the United Kingdom. Attitudes in Ulster to abortion and homosexuality are different and so is the law on these topics. These differences are a survival from the time of Stormont but they show how a local legislature can reflect these local values.

Thirdly only a local Parliament can give a forum for those matters which are unique to Ulster. Here one refers to the particular divisions within the Ulster community and the competing nationalisms. Some have said that we would be better with only Westminster where the particular issues of Ulster would be submerged. But the lesson from the past is that this does not happen. There must be a forum where Ulstermen can together come to terms with the problems that are unique to Ulster and with the socio-political pressures that have created those problems. Today those pressures essentially came from Northern Ireland alone, therefore it is only in Northern Ireland that the issues can be tackled. To look elsewhere, whether to London, Dublin, Europe or beyond for the sole means to resolve our problems is to evade the issue.

## ***Security***

Devolution is regarded as important by Unionists not only for its advantages in terms of Government generally but for its particular importance in terms of security. When the South of Ireland seceded from the Union in 1921, the I.R.A. made a determined attempt to force the North to come in, though in late 1921 and in 1922 a campaign was waged against the North. The divisions within the South between those in favour of the 1921 Treaty with Britain and those against were not

allowed to stand in the way of this campaign. Michael Collins supplied firearms to his opponents in the South on condition that they supplied equal members to the I.R.A. in the North. But this campaign petered out in the summer of 1922. Why? Responsibility for internal security was then transferred to Stormont. It was not any startling new measures introduced by Stormont that ended the onslaught, but the fact that it was then firmly established.

Then as now I.R.A. strategy was based on persuading London to give up. They know that they cannot persuade Ulster Unionists to abandon their nationality or their homeland. Once the rights of Unionists were firmly established the I.R.A. knew their cause was hopeless.

The facts speak for themselves. The years when Stormont was in control of security from 1922 until the Hunt Report in 1969 were years of peace. There were occasional disturbances but they were insignificant compared to what preceded those years and what has come after them.

It is in the best interests of all to seek a return to such stability.

## ***The Last Word***

However we shall leave the last words on the need for devolution to others. In 1973 the **Royal Commission on the Constitution** reported (CMND 5460) it had studied the constitution of the whole United Kingdom. It consisted of sixteen distinguished politicians, academics, industrialists, trade unionists and others. (Not one of which was an Ulster Unionist.) It commented,

"We have no doubt at all that home rule was of considerable value to Northern Ireland. Particularly in the large areas of Government which were unaffected, or at least not dominated, by the community problem, conspicuous progress was made under it. Perhaps the most impressive of these was in the field of health, where Northern Ireland, which used to be well below the standards of Great Britain, caught up with and in some respects surpassed them. The other social services were steadily built up. Education was greatly improved . . . economic policy was flexible and imaginative and, though the level of unemployment continued to be higher than the average for Great Britain, the gap had been significantly narrowed at the time of the outbreak of the disturbances. Considerable progress was made in diversifying the economy of the Province. It must be questioned



whether so much would have been accomplished in all these fields without a separate administration to watch over the affairs of Northern Ireland.

The conclusion we reached after taking evidence, therefore, was that Northern Ireland should continue to have a separate subordinate legislature and a Government of its own," (Paragraphs 1264-5).

Finally a spokesman for a Roman Catholic Teacher Training College in Belfast (St. Joseph's) when complaining in November 1981 about a proposal to reorganise teacher training which he argued would ride roughshod over what he saw as the needs of the Catholic Schools, commented, "It would not have happened under Stormont".

## Civil Rights in Ulster

## Civil Rights in Ulster

***It is said that the Stormont Parliament failed, and that renewed devolution is difficult, if not impossible because of the "community problems". These terms are reminiscent of those used in the American civil rights campaigns. Sometimes the problem is described in terms of political rights. In this section reference will be made to the extent of civil rights in Ulster and the various proposals that have been made for political structures.***

Because the Stormont Parliament was a subordinate legislature it did have a constitution, namely the Act of the Westminster Parliament which created it. That Act, the Government of Ireland Act 1920, "did seek to protect human rights to some extent by imposing restrictions on the exercise of governmental powers. It contained provisions prohibiting the Parliament of Northern Ireland from legislating in a number of ways. The Northern Ireland Parliament could not establish endow, prohibit or restrict any religion; it could not give preference or impose disability on account of religious belief or status; it was prevented from making the validity of a marriage conditional on a religious belief or ceremony; and from requiring a child attending a publically financed school to undergo religious instruction there. The fabric of Cathedral Churches was protected as was other property of religious denominations, which could however be taken for specified public purposes and on payment of compensation" . . . (The Act also banned both preferences and disabilities on account of religious belief when the executive power was exercised.

"Despite the limited scope of these provisions they may be said to have represented an embryonic form of legally enforceable Bill of Rights".

(From *The Protection of Human Rights by Law in Northern Ireland*, a

report by the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights CMND 7009, page 9.)

The remarkable thing about this "embryonic Bill of Rights" is that in the fifty years it was in existence very few cases were brought in the Courts. Indeed the **only** case in which religious discrimination was alleged involved an action brought by a Protestant claiming that an Act providing for certain grants to Roman Catholic Schools was unconstitutional. As a result of the case fresh legislation was passed, but doubts will remain about the legality of various grants to Catholic Schools and Hospitals.

Despite this the Northern Ireland Constitution Act 1973 sought to extend the constitutional protection of human rights. It made void any legislative provision which discriminated against any person or class of person on the ground of religious belief or political opinion and it also outlaws any action by a member of the Government or a public body which discriminates or aids, induces or incites another to discriminate on grounds of religious belief or political opinion.

In the last eight years just one case has been brought under these provisions. In it a District Council was held to have discriminated against the Gaelic Athletic Association. But the Court also held that the G.A.A. itself discriminated against people on grounds of their political opinion. Unfortunately Government has continued to ignore this part of the ruling and continues to make grants to the G.A.A. thus aiding it to discriminate against others.

The absence of case law on these issues must be significant. Anti-Unionists have tried to explain this away by claiming that people discriminated against did not bring actions because they lacked "confidence" in the system. But this indeed is special pleading. Mr. Kevin Boyle is a Lawyer who at one time put forward this argument and who was active in the late sixties in a group called "Peoples Democracy" (The phrase has the same meaning as when used in Eastern Europe) which was largely responsible for fomenting the present troubles. At a conference in 1980 he said when referring to judicial supervision of certain Government activities,

"Let it not be said against the case for such supervision that one is reluctant to give such a task to the Northern Ireland judiciary. The extraordinary achievement of the judiciary in Northern Ireland over this decade of political conflict and violence is a matter for record".

(Published in "Do We Need A Bill Of Rights" Ed Campbell, Page 89.)

In the early seventies, in response to the naive belief that the agitation



in Ulster had something to do with civil rights there was a veritable stream of "reformist" legislation. The following are only examples:—

\* The post of Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration was created in 1969. The function of the Commissioner is to investigate complaints of maladministration against Government Departments. In his first reports the Commissioner commented that in general the citizens of Northern Ireland enjoyed a better quality of administration than those in the rest of the Kingdom. Very few complaints have been made on political or religious grounds. Even fewer have been substantiated.

\* In the same year a Commissioner for Complaints against local councils and public bodies was created. The volume of complaints is so low that the job is now done by the same person who discharges the role of Parliamentary Commissioner.

\* In 1970 a Police Authority was established as an independent body to maintain the Police Force. The Authority has an involvement in complaints against the Police. Many such complaints are made but very very few are substantiated. Complaints are standard by terrorists. In 1977 the establishment of a Police Complaints Board introduced a further independent element into the investigation of complaints against the Police.

\* In 1976 the Fair Employment Act came into force making it unlawful for an Employer to discriminate on grounds of religious belief or political opinion. The Act also created a Fair Employment Agency with sweeping powers to eliminate discrimination. Since then there has been much publicity for the cases in which the Agency has managed to prove discrimination. These cases can be counted on the fingers of one hand! Much less publicity has been given to the research work of the Agency's staff which proves that the differential in employment is **not** due to religious discrimination. (See *The Contemporary Population of Northern Ireland*, Ed Compton pages 122-4 and 127-141, Q.U.B. 1981).

In addition to all these changes the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights — a commission established in 1973 to further advise the Government — recommended that a Bill of Rights, modelled on the European Convention on Human Rights, be enacted.

In this it could be said that the Commission were behind the times for in 1975 all the major Ulster Unionist Parties had united in recommending the enactment of such a Bill. However Government has not responded to the call. There are a number of reasons why. First there are technical

legal difficulties in implementing it. Secondly, the United Kingdom is a signatory to the European Convention and any citizen who feels the convention has been broken has a right to bring a case before the European Court. Republican sympathisers have done so on a couple of occasions, but with no real success. At the moment some Unionists are pursuing an action against the Government because of its failure to vindicate the right to life. So, in a sense, the European Convention already applies. Thirdly, the enactment of the Convention would make little or no difference. The Advisory Commission itself recognised this when it said,

"We should emphasise that we are under no illusion about the impact which incorporation of the European Convention would be likely to have upon the central problem of violence in Northern Ireland. We do not believe (and this view was shared by almost all the witnesses who gave us the benefit of their views) that the incorporation of the Convention (or indeed the introduction of a Bill of Rights in any other form) would by itself have **any measurable effect** on those engaged in the campaign of violence so as to discourage their activities." (Report, page 59, emphasis added.)

**So the Ulster problem is not a civil rights problem.** At long last Unionists who said that at the very beginning and were scorned by the world have been vindicated! Unionists said then that the problem was one of republican terrorism masquerading as a civil rights movement. Since then all the civil rights conceivable have been protected and doubly protected. The result is that the mask has fallen and the real nature of the beast should be clear to all!

## ***The Participation of Minorities in Government***

As soon as the so called civil rights issues were tackled, demands switched away from protecting the rights of individual citizens to political involvement and political structures. We have been told that the issue now is "minority participation" in the political structures.

Now in dealing with this issue two points must be made at the outset.

1. **Every individual in Ulster has exactly the same political rights and so exactly the same opportunities for involvement in the political structure.** If it were to be suggested that the political rights of certain persons were to be reduced the proposal would be denounced as outrageous. Yet some people, seemingly unconscious of the absurdity of their proposals, actually suggest that certain political groups be given **extra** rights over and above

those rights that all share. Such a proposal is indistinguishable from a suggestion to reduce the rights of others.

2. **To talk about "the minority" is inherently sectarian and divisive.** Many refer to "the minority" or "the religious minority" in terms which make it clear that they are referring to the Roman Catholic population in Ulster. But there are many religious minorities in Northern Ireland. But the Jewish minority, the Episcopalian minority, the Presbyterian minorities (for there are five different varieties of Presbyterianism) do not give rise to the issues in the minds of those who speak of "the minority". No one could suggest that the conflict is **only** about religion. If it were then guarantees about freedom of worship would suffice.

**It must be emphasised that the issues in Ulster are essentially political, concerning national allegiance and culture, rather than religious.** True religion contributes to and interacts with the political issues, but the problem is best approached as a political issue.

Now if you consider the problem of a political minority, you would normally ask, "a minority on what issue?" If that question is applied to Northern Ireland it becomes clear that this particular political minority is identified by its opposition to the existence of Northern Ireland. For it is on that issue and that issue only that this group is always in a minority. If other political issues are raised concerning economic issues or moral or social questions they would find themselves sometimes in a majority, sometimes not. But there would be nothing permanent in that context.

It is only the "border issue" that identifies and holds together those called "anti Unionists".

To suggest that these groups — identified only by their opposition to the state of Northern Ireland — should be guaranteed a place in the Government of that state, or should hold a veto over the creation of structures of Government in that state must offend against all notions of fairness and common sense.

Yet that is precisely what the Heath Government set out to do in 1973. They called it "power sharing". The essence of the idea was that the Government would be **selected** by the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, an English politician, and that he would select an Executive that would contain representatives of "the minority". This was interpreted then and since as representatives of the S.D.L.P. So just as Ford told the customer that, "You can have any colour of car so long as it is black", so

the democracy of Ulster was told, "You can have any Government you like so long as it contains the S.D.L.P.".

The idea was simply a negation of democracy. It prevented the people from choosing their Government. For under that form of Government it would have been impossible for the electorate to vote out the Government and vote in a new one. In late 1973 as the intention of the Heath Government became clear, opinion in Ulster moved sharply against it. In the Westminster Elections in February 1974 candidates opposed to "power sharing" won 11 out of the 12 seats and secured over 51% of the popular vote. By any standard it had been rejected, yet the powersharing executive clung to power. In these exceptional circumstances, it became necessary to resort to extra Parliamentary action — the constitutional stoppage of May 1974 which brought down the executive.

These events demonstrated a simple truth — **No system of Government can survive if it is opposed by a majority.** This produces a simple "catch 22" — power sharing cannot work unless it is supported by a majority — if it is supported by a majority then constitutional guarantees of powersharing are unnecessary.

Successive British Governments have recognised that there can be no return to the structures of 1973 and its powersharing executive. They also say that there should not be a return to simple majority rule pattern of pre 1972 days.

The position of Unionists has been that we are prepared to go to the limit within the Parliamentary system. There are a number of ways in which this can be done. An important one was indicated in the Report of the Northern Ireland Constitutional Convention. That proposed an extensive system of back bench committees to ensure that **all** members can play a full part in Parliamentary business. These committees are based on the committees of the U.S. Congress in terms of their powers to scrutinise Government actions, consider legislation and even initiate legislation, and also in terms of their staff. A novel proposal was that the committees should have membership drawn equally from Government supporters and members of the Opposition. In such a system it was envisaged that half of the committee chairmanships would be held by opposition members.

We think that this system would make a tremendous difference to Parliament by distributing power within the Parliamentary system. When the proposals were being finalised in the Convention we consulted



Professor Bernard Crick, an acknowledged expert on Parliamentary procedure, he said,

"The essence of your proposals I find excellent, something that goes far beyond existing Westminster practice in giving rights to an opposition but without at the end of the day, making decisions impossible. I think it goes as far as a Parliamentary system can go in this direction and would be seen as an imaginative and genuine initiative and shows sensitivity not merely on behalf of an agreement with the minority parties, to general fears of too much executive powers."

In addition Unionists are prepared to explore other ways of making Parliament more effective and of involving all members actively in Parliamentary business. Mention has been made of the use of the Privy Council and a possible upper chamber or senate. All these could be explored, provided they are consistent with basic democratic principles.

It is said that these arrangements fall short of giving "the minority" posts in Government and that they would find themselves a permanent opposition. But the answer to that is that it is their all-Ireland aspirations which place them in a minority. If they were prepared to work within the existing structures for the good of the people of Northern Ireland then the present majority minority position would disappear. It is precisely the refusal of the Republican parties to work in that way which prolongs the impasse.


Republicans say that this approach would require them to abandon their aspiration for a United Ireland. This is not true. The periodic ten year border polls would enable them still to register their aspiration. Indeed these polls were intended, "to take the border out of politics". Unfortunately the concept of power sharing puts the border back into politics.

The ideas outlined above show that Unionists have been flexible in their efforts to accommodate people within the democratic system. Unfortunately the Republican parties have been completely intransigent and have refused to participate in Northern Ireland politics except on terms which suit themselves and would spell the ruin of Northern Ireland in the long run. While they are supported in this attitude by the Dublin Government and others Ulster politics will remain unchanged.

## **THE SAVAGERY OF THE I.R.A.**

## THE SAVAGERY OF THE I.R.A.

*The following photographs speak for themselves. They expose the relentless terror unleashed on the law abiding people of Ulster for over 12 long years by the I.R.A., a part of its attempt to force Ulster into an all Ireland Republic against the expressed wish of its people.*



*In February 1972 Minister of State in N. Ireland, John D. Taylor, was critically shot seven times by the I.R.A. terrorists. He is now a Member of the European Parliament and a Member of the Operation U.S.A. Team of Unionist M.P.'s.*





*A former U.D.R. reservist who was assassinated in his car in an ambush, in South Derry, in April 78.*



*The decomposed body of an I.R.A. victim found by an R.U.C. search party.*





*The remains of an I.R.A. victim being removed from the scene of his death.*



*A passenger train blown up by I.R.A. terrorists.*





*Yet another victim of I.R.A. terrorism.*



*Typical damage of Ulster property — result of I.R.A. terrorism.*



***Bullet in head — result of I.R.A. terrorism.***



***Chair leg through limb  
— result of I.R.A. terrorism.***





***Severed leg — result of I.R.A. terrorism.***



***Mutilated head — result of I.R.A. terrorism.***



***A human being — result of I.R.A. terrorism.***



***No arms for life — result of I.R.A. terrorism.***





*The last journey of a member of the Security Forces assassinated by the I.R.A.*



*In this one incident 18 lives were lost — result of I.R.A. terrorism.*



*Soldiers rush to the aid of a dying colleague shot by the I.R.A.*



*An injured soldier is kicked and stoned by Republicans as he lies on the ground.*





*Two boys carry their father's coffin to the grave. He was an ambulance man killed by the I.R.A. while in the Royal Victoria Hospital.*



*Ulster mourns her dead — thousands of Ulstermen and women attend a service at the Belfast Cenotaph in memory of I.R.A. victims.*

## **TERRORISM and the Law in Ulster**

# TERRORISM and the Law in Ulster

***Terrorism strikes at the rule of law. It is a deliberate assault on society. If change is sought in Ulster it can be done peacefully, there are democratic elections, there is a referendum on the border so those who want a united Ireland could seek it peacefully. But republicans do not try to persuade people to vote for them. Instead they try to impose their will by violence. Such violence must be countered by society, but doing so may involve a departure from the ideals of due process which are so much a part of the common law tradition.***

## **Countering terrorism**

Republican terrorists have murdered magistrates, judges and prosecutors — in this they seem to concentrate their ire on Roman Catholics. They have also shot witnesses and warned people not to give evidence. Juries have been intimidated, policemen and prison officers killed by the hundred!

Where this happens convictions become difficult and it is unfair to expect jurors and witnesses to risk their lives. Ordinary Law enforcement becomes practically impossible. Society has a choice, do nothing and see evil triumph or take steps which may interfere with civil liberties. In reality there is no choice, society must be defended. The only question is, How?

## **Two Alternatives**

You could dispense with the ordinary trial process and have a system of detention without trial or you could change the trial system and the rules of evidence.

Detention separates the emergency system from the due process so that it remains pure: but it is said that detention is too drastic and does more harm than just making the minimum necessary changes to the criminal process.

Detention was used with apparent success in the troubles during World War II and in the border campaign in the fifties, but was resorted to a bit too late in these troubles. But in the earlier cases the Irish government had followed suit and detained the I.R.A. south of the border. This time the Dublin government did not and allowed the I.R.A. shelter.

## **The Diplock system**

As detention was unsuccessful a different system was tried. This is called the "Diplock Courts" after Lord Diplock, a senior Judge, whose committee recommended their introduction. Their main features are, (a) trial by Judge alone, (b) any statement by the accused is admissible unless it is obtained by "torture, inhuman or degrading treatment", (c) those in illegal possession of firearms or explosives are treated as having committed an offence unless they can prove otherwise.

The last item does change the onus of proof in those cases but has not been controversial. It is (a) and (b) which have caused the controversy.

Propagandists say that the Judges who try terrorist cases are biased against republicans.

## **Biased Judges?**

The accusations are inherently improbable. The Judges are experienced and respected lawyers. Unlike American Judges they are not elected nor are they political appointments. They are appointed on merit and hold office for life. There are over 15 of these Judges of which 3 are Roman Catholic — there would be more but for the murderous attacks on Catholic Judges.

If the Judges were biased there would be a low acquittal rate. The latest study is one published by the Cobden Trust (linked to the National Council for Civil Liberties). Table 1 seems to show a low acquittal rate,



dropping to 4%, but the percentage pleading guilty in open court has risen from 59% in 1974 to 79% in 1979. So the acquittal rate in apparently contested cases varies from 30% to 21%. The **true** acquittal rate is higher. Many "not guilty" pleas are technical ones entered by the court for people who refuse to recognise the court and who say nothing in answer to the evidence against them. When the figures were re-examined with this in mind the acquittal rate was between 47% and 35% (Table 2). This is not the work of case hardened Judges determined to obtain convictions.

## **Sentencing**

The survey proves that there is no bias in sentencing as between republicans and loyalists. Table 3 even indicates that loyalists are treated more severely. This is because some republicans are just charged with membership of an illegal organisation and light sentences are given for this. The authors of the report comment on Table 4 as follows: —

"We have carried out a similar detailed analysis of the length of custodial sentences. In this respect ... there was a much greater degree of similarity in the range of sentences imposed, and this was maintained when such factors as the nature and seriousness of the principle offence and the offender's previous record were taken into account"

## **Confessions**

Because of intimidation convictions can only be obtained when terrorists are caught "red-handed" or confess. So I.R.A. propagandists claim that prisoners are ill-treated during questioning to try and discredit the confessions their members make. Cases have been produced which are said to prove this. Amnesty International, after a lightning trip, said it was convinced. So the government established a Committee of Inquiry. Its report (The Bennett Report) shows that there was no policy of ill-treatment. In some cases injuries resulted from prisoners fighting among themselves and some injuries were self inflicted. But the Committee did find that some injuries had been inflicted by police officers (often as a result of provocation by prisoners). In a statement to Parliament in 1979 it was said that of the 3,000 cases in 1977 and 1979 investigated by the Committee there were only 15 cases of injuries which were not self inflicted or otherwise accounted for. Moreover if there is ill treatment the statement will be excluded in court. Between July 1976 and June 1978,

15 confessions were held to be inadmissible, and prosecutors decided not to proceed in a further 11 cases because the confessions seemed suspect. There have only been a couple of cases where damages have been recovered in civil actions for assault while being questioned — and these cases are heard before juries! Virtually all the police officers prosecuted for assault — private prosecution and state ones — have been dismissed. All this goes to prove that any abuses are few and far between.

## **New safeguards**

After this Inquiry, to avoid the suspicion of blame, the police introduced a very detailed system to control questioning including the televising of all interviews! In addition there is an elaborate complaints procedure and a police authority with independent representation and the power to order inquiries.

***So once again we find that behind all the smoke of republican propaganda there is no fire — just a few embers.***

It is important to remember that the Diplock system only applies to terrorist cases. In the Irish Republic they also have special courts for this purpose with no juries and changes to the law of evidence greater than in Ulster.

The Diplock system is in accordance with International Law. The European Convention on Human Rights permits derogation from its provisions on trials "in time of war or any other public emergency to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation". Challenges have been mounted in the European Court against detention, the Diplock courts and the prison system — they have all failed. The changes in Ulster law as a result of terrorism are regrettable but they are no greater than those in any other liberal democracy facing similar threats.

**TABLE 1**  
**Cases in Diplock Courts**

	No. of persons	Pleaded guilty	Plead not guilty & convicted	Acquitted	Apparent acquittals in cases contested
1974	1,228	59%	29%	13%	30%
1975	1,177	65%	27%	7%	21%
1976	991	67%	26%	7%	21%
1979	851	79%	16%	4%	22%

**TABLE 2**  
**Acquittal rate in cases where accused pleaded not guilty and actually contested the case.**

1974	47%
1975	36%
1976	35%
1979	35%

**TABLE 3**  
**Types of sentence imposed where defendant found guilty. 1979 cases sampled.**

	Non custodial sentences i.e. absolute discharge or probation	Custodial i.e. imprisonment or detention of juveniles
Loyalist	18%	82%
Republican	37%	63%

**TABLE 4**  
**Length of prison sentences (1979 cases)**

	1-3 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	over 10	Life
Loyalist	21%	24%	13%	18%	19%
Republican	22%	21%	18%	24%	7%

## Anglo Irish Relations



## Anglo Irish Relations

The other area of conflict concerns relations with the Irish Republic. Here there have been clamant demands for an institutionalised "Irish dimension". The history of this is relevant. When the 1920 Act proposed Parliaments for Northern Ireland and Southern Ireland, it also proposed a Council of Ireland to act as a link between the two.

In the event only the Northern Parliament appointed representatives to the Council. The South boycotted it and it lapsed. Why? The Council was to be a link between two regions within the United Kingdom. When Southern Ireland seceded from the Union the Council became inappropriate. You cannot have a link between a region of one country and a sovereign independent state. Yet an attempt was made in 1973 to recreate this institution.

### *The Council of Ireland*

It was to be a body linking North and South with three tiers. A Council of Ministers, including members of Governments North and South, a Parliamentary tier with members of the legislatures of the Irish Republic and Northern Ireland and a civil service tier. The Council was to have "harmonising" functions and provision was actually made for the transfer of executive powers from the Northern Ireland Executive to the Council of Ireland. Republicans triumphantly regarded it as the Government of a United Ireland in embryo. **Unionists rejected it and it has disappeared!**

Now an attempt is being made to achieve indirectly what was then attempted directly. An Anglo-Irish Council is being established. This approach is adopted because Unionists could, and would block a purely Irish approach. Instead it was thought that they could not object to the Government of the United Kingdom acting for the entire country.

What is the Council to consist of? There is to be a secretariat, a Council of Ministers and later "at an appropriate time" an Anglo-Irish

body at Parliamentary level. It is then a pale imitation of the 1973 Council.

Its function? The communique issued in November 1981 is studiously vague. Economic co-operation is mentioned as is co-operation on social and cultural matters. Security is mentioned. Joint Studies which had been commissioned on citizenship rights and other matters were published but the communique was careful not to commit itself to any of the matters in those studies. This low keyed approach is deliberate. Government admits that the approach is made in this way so as not to offend Unionists. In other words what is being done would be offensive to them and so we are doing it quietly in the hope that they will not notice. But the communique does contain its key words. The object of the exercise is to "reconcile the peoples of the two parts of Ireland".

The word reconciliation is these days scarcely absent from the lips of people with United Ireland aspirations. It is clear from the way they use the term that their vision of a reconciled Ireland so indistinguishable from their vision of a United Ireland. In short "reconciliation" is a code word for Irish Unity. Then in case you had not got the message from the use of the term "reconcile", reference is made to "the two parts of Ireland". What do you do when you find something lying in two parts? Why you put it back together again!

**The message from the London summit is clear — though expressed in veiled terms — it is the Government's object to try and ease Ulster out of the Union while paying lip-service to the principle of self determination.**

Their aims were summed up by Professor Claire Palley in "The Constitution of Northern Ireland" (Ed. David Watt a Joint Study in Public Policy published in 1981).

"United Kingdom Government's aim, in the short run, to diminish terrorist violence and foster intercommunity reconciliation. In the mid term, they seek withdrawal of troops from Northern Ireland and the transfer to Northern Ireland institutions of Governmental powers on a basis agreed by both communities. In the long run, they wish to disentangle Great Britain from Ireland . . . some nuisance of Irish nationalist claims, would be preferred . . . Since institutional change in Northern Ireland cannot now be agreed upon or imposed, the best way forward is to attempt to engineer long term attitude changes in the Unionist community. This could be portrayed as brainwashing . . ." (page 185).



*Margaret Thatcher.  
Participants at the Dublin/London Summit.*

## **Threats**

It is not just a matter of brainwashing. The threat that faces Ulster Unionism is one which not only threatens their existence as a separate cultural group, but one which threatens even their physical existence. The true face of Irish Republicanism is not the polite mask of an urbane Dublin politician but the masked visage of the terrorist advancing, as a Sein Fein spokesman put at their conference in Dublin this Autumn, with "a ballot paper in one hand and an armalite (automatic rifle) in the other". At the same venue Owen Carron, the Republican M.P. for Fermanagh, declared that Ulster Unionism "must be smashed".

That is the true message to which the soft tones of the Anglo Irish Summit are but a bulling echo. Conor Cruise O'Brien, a former Foreign Minister in Dublin, summed it up in a recent article in the Observer newspaper. The choice before Unionists he said was to, "give in, get out, or be slaughtered".

To that reality the Anglo-Irish Council is an obscene irrelevance. It is worse. Because it signals to the world Britain's willingness to see the Union liquidated "at an appropriate time", it encourages the terrorists to increase their campaign.

**It is no coincidence that the wave of killings that culminated in the murder of the Rev. Robert Bradford M.P. — a coldly planned symbolic attack on the entire Unionist and Protestant community — followed on the heels of the Anglo-Irish Summit.**

Unionists will insist on their right to self determination. They have no choice. They must resist or be smashed. They will also insist that others too recognise that right and urge them to desist from attempts to undermine it.

We do not oppose co-operation with the Irish Republic on matters of mutual interest. There is no stumbling block to such co-operation on our side. But there are obstacles on the side of the Irish Republic. Obstacles that arise out of the hostile attitudes in the South to Northern Ireland and its people. All too often we have seen Dublin try to exploit these matters for political gain. **We would insist that co-operation be founded on mutual respect.** This must involve the Irish Republic respecting the views of the people of Northern Ireland and the abandonment of its attempts, both overt and covert, to subvert those views. Co-operation should mean a normalisation of relations, an abandonment of the Republic's iridescent claim to Northern Ireland and the development of proper arrangements concerning the fight against terrorism. This must



mean the Republic ensuring that its territory is not used as a base for attacks on Northern Ireland and is not a safe haven for terrorists.

### ***Conclusion***

We believe that the developments presaged by the London Summit are the wrong developments. They will not lead to peace — rather they will spur the Republican terrorists on. The damage which the Summit will inflict on the rights of Unionists will be balanced by no gains in other directions.

It would be best for the attempt to “brainwash” Unionists to be abandoned. It is morally wrong. It would confer no benefit even in the world of “real politics”.

Instead we believe the best course is to restore democratic self Government to the people of Northern Ireland. This can be done in a way that safeguards everybody’s rights and would provide the best hope for the future of those who are worried about the acceptability of this course. There is a simple test. Put it to the electorate. This could be done in an election or even a referendum.

At the end of the day, whatever the legal theories, sovereignty with the electorate and no arrangement that does not have their support can survive.

**What America  
needs to remember**

## What America needs to remember

*There is a truth that ought to be remembered or rediscovered by every American who takes a pride in his country and who values what is best in modern American civilisation. That civilisation ought to be marked "Made in Ulster".*

### **Ulster Looks West**

The hard experiences of the 17th century had created a tough, self-reliant British community in Ulster. Many of those who had settled in Ulster had come from Scotland with Calvinist traditions; and during the later 17th century they were joined by many more who came as refugees from the oppressive regime established in Scotland under Lauderdale. There was also much missionary activity, and many in Ulster who did not have this Scottish background also turned to Presbyterianism or some similarly Puritan tradition of religion. Some did this inside the framework of the established Anglican church.

In the early 18th century, life became oppressive for many free spirits in Ulster. As leases ran out, landlords in many areas demanded much more exacting terms from tenant farmers. The laws which upheld the ascendancy of the Anglican church discriminated severely against many Ulster Protestants who were not members of that church, excluding them from the professions and from public office and from access to representative institutions. Severe restrictions had been placed upon trade. There was also a series of bad harvests and some years of famine or near famine. Ulster people began to look towards the wider opportunities of another land.

### **Ulster breaks New Ground**

In 1718 five small ships landed 750 Ulster emigrants at Boston, Massachusetts; and from then on there was a steady stream of several thousand Ulster people arriving in the American colonies each year. Most of them passed through the coastal areas which had already been settled and took the lead in the westward advance along the wild frontier, battling against untamed nature and the Indians. Right down from Maine and New Hampshire, through Pennsylvania and the Carolinas, the Ulster immigrants became the advance guard of the new American civilisation.

It has been estimated that, by the time of the Declaration of Independence, these people from Ulster formed about a quarter of the entire population of the American colonies. Many of them had come to America with a strong sense of grievance, and they were quick to see and share the grievances of the American colonists. They were among the first to declare themselves in favour of complete independence.

These were the people later referred to by many American historians as the "Scotch Irish", a name which has somewhat obscured their origin and identity. They were distinctively Ulster people.

### **The War of Independence**

The first public demand for a complete break with Great Britain came from Ulstermen in what are called the Mecklenburg Resolutions. The Declaration of Independence, drafted by Jefferson, was written down by Charles Thomson, an Ulsterman, first Secretary of Congress. It was printed by an Ulsterman, and the first signature to it was that of an Ulsterman, John Hancock. Although the war is regarded as having begun in 1775 with the clash at Lexington, the Ulstermen of North Carolina had already fired what could later be seen as the first shots of the revolutionary war four years previously in a confrontation with the British on the Alamance River.

In the war that followed, the men of Ulster origin or ancestry formed the steel core of the American forces. Among the senior officers round Washington, there were a dozen Ulstermen to every man of English origin; and, whether in command or in the ranks, they were the ones who could be depended on to the end. Washington, at one depressing phase of the conflict, declared that "if defeated everywhere else, I will make my last stand for liberty among the Scotch-Irish of my native Virginia".



Final victory would pretty certainly not have been achieved without that virile and dedicated Ulster ingredient in the American population. An interesting aspect of the war was the fact that a high proportion of the British troops opposed to them were either Germans or Irish Roman Catholics. In the outcome it was indeed true for the British, as Lord Mountjoy told the British House of Commons, that "We have lost America through the Ulster Irish".

### ***The Building of Modern America***

After victory came the building of the new America; and here also the Ulster people made an enormous contribution. One can point to innumerable outstanding individuals in American life in the years that followed who were of Ulster ancestry. At least a dozen Presidents were of Ulster descent. Grant and Lee and other leaders of the Federal and Confederate forces in the tragic conflict of the civil war were of that stock. So were many figures of administration, industry, literature and the arts.

But a rollcall of eminent names would not be enough to indicate the pervasive Ulster influence on American life. That whole ethos which has made the strong heart of American civilisation — the integrity, the love of freedom, the Puritan acceptance of necessary obligation, the loyalty to one's fellow citizens — all this owes a massive debt to the Ulster people who came to America in the 18th century and made that land their own.

### ***No Hyphenation***

Some will ask why this powerful strand in American history is so little recognised, why, for example, it is so often confused with the totally different traditions of the Potato Famine Irish who came to America from the middle of the 19th century and had little in common with the Ulster people who came there a century earlier.

The simple explanation is that the Ulster people who decided to become Americans made their decision wholeheartedly and became real Americans, not "hyphenated" Americans. They gave themselves to America and did not attempt to leave one foot behind them in the only half understood politics of some other country.

### ***A Debt to Remember***

If Ulster's timely and enormously creative and effective contribution to the life and the very identity of modern America is not as fully appreciated in America as it ought to be, it is not forgotten in Ulster that America owes a debt to the Ulster people. Today they look to Americans to stand shoulder to shoulder with them in their time of need, to repudiate with contempt the lies that are told about Ulster, to reject with loathing the atrocities that are being perpetrated against the Ulster people, and to accept that the enemies of the Ulster people are the enemies of the American people.

# The Presidents from Ulster

*Acknowledgements to the N. I. Tourist Board.*

*Pencil sketches by Frank McKelvey RHA, 1895-1974 (Collection Ulster Museum)*



**James Knox Polk**  
11th President 1845-49

His great-great-great-grandfather, Capt. Robert Bruce Polk whose family came from Coleraine, County Londonderry, emigrated to Maryland in about 1680. Capt. Polk's wife was a Miss Tasker from Strabane. Both Polk and Jackson were: born in the Carolinas (Polk in N.C. in 1795) and moved to Tennessee, lawyers, Presbyterians, ardent Democrats and, for a time, Polk was called 'Young Hickory'.




**Andrew Jackson**  
7th President 1829-37

Born in 1767, probably at the Waxhaws in South Carolina in a log cabin, but said: 'I was born somewhere between Carrickfergus and the United States'. His parents emigrated in 1765 from Boneybefore, Carrickfergus, county Antrim. By the end of his presidency, he had quarrelled with many of the old campaigners, including that famous Indian scout Davy Crockett—son of an Ulsterman who left for America in 1782.




**James Buchanan**  
15th President 1857-61

His father, James Buchanan senior, emigrated from Ulster to Philadelphia and the future president was born in a Pennsylvanian log cabin in Franklin County in 1791. He once said: 'My Ulster blood is a priceless heritage'. President Buchanan never married, so there are no descendants. The ancestral home is at Deroran near Omagh in County Tyrone.



**Andrew Johnson**  
17th President 1865-69

Son of a janitor, he was born in Raleigh, North Carolina in 1808 and married a shoemaker's daughter who taught him to write. His grandfather, also called Andrew Johnson, came from Mounthill, Larne, County Antrim. Before emigrating in about 1750, Grandfather Johnson set up house with his bride a few miles from Larne at Ballyclare—thought to be the ancestral village of Mark Twain.



**Chester Alan Arthur**  
21st President 1881-85

His father, William Arthur, was born in a farmhouse at Dreen, Cullybackey, near Ballymena in 1796 and emigrated to America in 1816. There he became a Baptist minister and a noted antiquarian. The future president was probably born in Vermont, Canada, although his parents were American citizens. Of the 40 US presidents to date, only three have been first-generation Americans—Andrew Jackson, Buchanan and Arthur.



**Ulysses Simpson Grant**  
18th President 1869-77

President Grant was said to preside over 'more Ulstermen than Queen Victoria'. He was the great-grandson of John Simpson who was born in 1738 at Dergina, near Dungannon, County Tyrone, and left for Pennsylvania around 1760. Grant went to Ulster in 1878 and complimented the citizens of Londonderry on the 17th-century walls when he visited that historic city.



**Grover Cleveland**  
22nd & 24th President  
1885-89 & 1893-97

His maternal grandfather, Abner Neal, was a Scotch-Irish merchant from County Antrim who went to America in the late 18th century and became a bookseller and publisher of law books in Baltimore. His daughter, Anne, married Richard Falley Cleveland—father of Grover Cleveland who was born in New Jersey in 1837. Grover's first job was as a 50-dollars-a-year clerk in a village shop.





### **Benjamin Harrison**

**23rd President 1889-93**

His mother, Elizabeth Irwin, was descended from two great-grandfathers from Ulster: James Irwin, who went to America before 1750, and William McDowell, who emigrated around 1718. Benjamin's grandfather was President William Henry 'Old Tippecanoe' Harrison, and their paternal ancestors are reputed to have left Ulster in the 17th century. The family was Presbyterian.



### **Theodore Roosevelt**

**26th President 1901-04**

His mother was Martha Bulloch whose Scotch-Irish and Huguenot ancestors came from Larne in County Antrim—centre of Ulster's booming linen industry where Louis Crommelin and other Huguenot weavers settled in the 18th century. The site of the ancestral homestead has not yet been established but it was from Gleno, Larne, that Roosevelt's maternal forebears emigrated in May 1729.



### **William McKinley**

**25th President 1897-1901**

He was the great-great-grandson of James McKinley who emigrated from Conagher near Ballymoney, County Antrim, in about 1743. The ancestral homestead was burned during the 1798 'United Irishmen' uprising but the McKinley family stayed on and the farm at Conagher still bears their name. Born in Niles Ohio, in 1843, President McKinley was the third president to be assassinated.



### **Woodrow Wilson**

**28th President 1913-21**

Wilson was proud of his Ulster roots. Addressing the members of a New England society (he called them 'Virginian Cavaliers') in Brooklyn in 1896, he said: '... the Irish Scots although they are just as much in earnest as you are, have a little bit more gaiety and elasticity ... We believe as sincerely as you do that we really made this country.'